

**MINUTES**  
**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
**January 7<sup>th</sup>, 2004**  
**MDOT Secondary Center**  
**7575 Crowner Drive**  
**Lansing, Michigan**

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Approved amendments to the Minutes are listed below in bold, italic font.

**Present**

Carmine Palombo, Chairman

***Richard Deuell, Member***

John Kolessar, Member

Susan Mortel, Member

Eric Swanson, Member

Pat Lockwood, Commission Advisor

Thomas Wieczorek, Vice Chairman

Aaron Hopper, Member

Bill McEntee, Member

Jerry Richards, Member

Steve Warren, Member

**Absent**

Kirk Steudle, Member

**Staff Present**

Rick Lilly, Bureau of Transportation Planning

Rob Surber, Center for Geographic Information

Ron Vibbert, Bureau of Transportation Planning

Gil Chesbro, Bureau of Transportation Planning

Brad Winkler, Bureau of Transportation Planning

**Call to Order**

Chairman Palombo called the meeting to order at 1:10pm.

**Approval of the December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2003 Council Minutes**

Mr. McEntee moved for the approval of the December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2003, meeting minutes and was supported by Vice Chair Wieczorek. The minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

**Correspondence and Announcements**

Ms. Lockwood announced that the State Transportation Commission did not and will not meet during the month of December. However, the Commission will still be holding a workshop for the 5-Year Transportation Program. The Commission will meet again on the last Thursday in January.

Mr. Lilly noted that a letterhead design has been created for the Council's use, and he will be e-mailing the document to all members.

## **Committee Reports**

### **Administrative and Education Committee (reported by Vice Chair Wieczorek):**

Vice Chair Wieczorek reported that the Council is running under budget. Some of the estimates were a little higher than the actual costs incurred during the fiscal year. Vice Chair Wieczorek reported (as stated in the [Year-End Expense Report](#)) for the fiscal year 2003 our costs were \$172,181.47. For the fiscal year 2004 our costs are 114,903.47 (pending outstanding expenditures that have not cleared). Additionally, Vice Chair Wieczorek noted that the equipment purchased for data collection was billed to the Department and did not come out of the Council's funds. The total expenditures incurred by the Council during 2003 were \$518,088.86. If you would like more information and a breakdown of costs, please visit the link above.

Vice Chair Wieczorek also updated the Council on the initial discussion regarding the outline for the 2004 Annual Report. Vice Chair Wieczorek reported some of the following items are required under Section 9 of the Act 51: 1) certified mileage, 2) conditions of the roads and bridges, 3) receipts and disbursements of road and street funds, 4) results of activities conducted by the Council 5) Council expenditures and 6) activities that the Council has planned for the upcoming year. These requirements replace the Needs Study that used to be conducted. The outline would include an introduction, a synopsis or summary statement that provides the legislatures a quick report to sum up our efforts. Vice Chair Wieczorek also suggested including an overview of PASER and talk about differences between some of the other pavement management systems. Thirdly, we would report on the condition of the federal aid eligible system to include a description of our procedures and our results. Next, we would report on the investments of the system. Vice Chair Wieczorek noted that there were a number of problems in reporting this information. Some of these problems include: the language used in reporting, reporting standards are different from GASB 34, and the way in which different agencies record the funds and therefore reported them. Mr. Warren questioned if we would be reporting the challenges we have faced in our first year of data collection. He continued asking if it was the Council's intent in the Annual Report was to give the Commission an idea of where we are and where we want to go. Vice Chair Wieczorek replied saying that the Council could hopefully educate the Commission on the results of the data collection in relation to the investment on the system, so that there are no misunderstandings. With this approach in mind, Mr. Lilly added that the report should look similar to an investment analysis reporting all investments that are actually being made to the road system as opposed to just the dollar amounts that are currently being reported. Mr. Lilly also mentioned that we should put together an executive report to highlight some of our accomplishments this year, and where we intend to be headed in the coming years. Mr. Lilly asked that the Council keep in mind that the Annual Report would need to be wrapped up and approved by the April meeting, so that it can be received by the Legislators on the due date in May. Chairman Palombo asked that the draft be sent out prior to the April Council meeting, so that the members can carefully look over the information.

### **Data Management Committee (reported by Mr. McEntee):**

Mr. McEntee reported that the Data Committee has suggested that (for this year) we utilize the Act 51 data as best as we possibly can. The Act 51 data is the only cohesive financial reports available. We will extensively document the difficulties in using this data for Asset Management processes / procedures. Secondly, the Committee

discussed the suggestion of storing the data on a separate server. The consensus was that we would wait until the coming year when budgetary issues improve. Thirdly, Mr. Lilly explored the ideas of implementing another Committee between the cities and counties for long-term development of the data.

Chairman Palombo asked Mr. McEntee to elaborate on the reasons the Council would need our own server to house the data. Mr. McEntee replied stating that it is a question of security. The data will be modified and accessed by many people, and having our own server will allow for higher levels of security. ***The intent of the statement should be as follows: the Council does not need to attain our own server on behalf of the security of the data at this point. The Council would need to entertain that idea when the data will be made available for processing.***

#### **Strategic Analysis Committee (reported by Mr. Warren):**

Mr. Warren reported that the Committee's main focus was on the December workshop. In particular, the Committee focused on the proposed '*strategic statement*'. Mr. Warren noted that the Committee decided that the statement should identify where we are headed and our overarching mission. Additionally, the statement should provide a goal for the Council. Therefore, Mr. Warren developed the Goal Statement. Please see website for the [Goal Statement](#). The goal statement's main initiative is investing through collaboration and coordination between everyone (the transportation industry of Michigan). The statement continues to list the 4 steps or sub-goals. These 4 items are: surveying of the road system, assessing of completed and planned projects, supporting the development of tools and procedures, and education and training in implementing the procedures of Asset Management. Mr. Warren asked that the Council adopt the goal statement. Vice Chair Wieczorek moved for the approval of the Goal Statement, supported by Ms. Mortel. The Goal Statement was unanimously approved. Ms. Mortel asked when we intend to have our next work plan prepared. Mr. Lilly replied that the work plan should be created no later than March.

#### **Year-End Report**

Mr. Lilly reported to the Council that the Year-End Report is composed of 3 main parts. The first is a highlight of the year 2003. The second part is an analysis of the month to month activities stated in our work breakdown. The analysis indicates where the Council has accomplished the activities, and also the report highlights the areas that still need to be worked on in 2004. The third portion of the Year-End Report is comprised of the Year-End Expense Report. Mr. Lilly noted that this report serves for the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report as well. Please see the [Year-End Report](#) on our website. Vice Chair Wieczorek moved for the approval of the Year-End Report supported by Mr. Deuell. The Year-End Report was unanimously approved.

#### **Discussion of HB 5231**

This bill requires counties to get 2/3 approval of township's in their county prior to submitting their list of projects in the Multi-Year Program report. Mr. Lilly noted that this bill may be in violation of the Freedom of Information Act. The bill requires 2/3 approval of township's before any information can be published, therefore restricting access of

the data. Ms. Motel also commented that an analysis of the bill should be conducted so that we can understand its purpose.

### **Presentation on Results of Data Collection Effort**

Mr. Chesbro and Mr. Winkler updated the council on the initial analyses of the PASER data collection information.

Mr. Chesbro first noted that the data will be analyzed in relation to lane miles. Lane miles are calculated by taking the length of any given segment and multiplying that by the number of lanes. Mr. Chesbro also mentioned that lane miles are usually directly related to the population density of the area.

Next, Mr. Chesbro commented on the three groupings in which the data was analyzed. The first group, Routine Maintenance includes PASER ratings between 10 and 8. The second group, Capital Preventative Maintenance includes PASER ratings between 7 and 5. The third group, Structural Improvement includes PASER ratings between 4 and 1. Mr. Chesbro continued to present the initial analyses of the data, please stay tuned for more information and publications on the results of the data collection.

Lastly, Mr. Chesbro mentioned there was some disconnect between the Sufficiency results and our PASER results. Mr. Chesbro noted that this could be due to our training efforts, and we will be working on improving our definitions and standards for rating the roads. Mr. McEntee asked if there were any other ratings done that we could use to compare our PASER data. Mr. Chesbro suggested using the IRI figures. Mr. Lilly also told the Council that this data is still preliminary, and we do not have the data ready to be used for Asset Management procedures.

### **Adjournment and Final Comments**

Chairman Palombo suggested postponing the presentation to the Commission until February. Mr. Lilly suggested that the Commission hold a workshop or series of workshops to get the Commission's input on the initial PASER data. Mr. Lilly agreed to talk with Ms. Lockwood to discuss setting this workshop up.

Ms. Mortel announced that the review of NFC is currently being conducted by Ms. Susan Berquist. Ms. Mortel suggested having Ms. Berquist conduct a presentation to talk about procedures, time lines, and how this review will affect the Council. Ms. Mortel asked that Mr. Lilly add this item to the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Lilly also reminded the Council that we are scheduled to go out and do several follow-up meetings to get feedback about the Asset Management process. Meetings have been scheduled for the second week in February in Escanaba, Gaylord, and Traverse City. A report will be created for the March meeting to highlight comments made during these feedback meetings.

Chairman Palombo asked if there were any public comments. No public comments were made; there were no members of the public in attendance at this meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 3:20pm.

---

Commission Advisor